

REMARKS

OBJECTIONS TO INFORMALITIES

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 because the term "electrophile" should not be underlined. Appropriate correction has been made by simply removing the underline. If the Examiner believes that another amendment would be more appropriate, Applicants would be willing to follow the Examiner's recommendation.

The Examiner has objected to claims 22 and 24-27 because the letter "A" should be included after the term "group" for consistency in terminology. Appropriate correction has been made.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner believes that claims 22 and 23 are ambiguous as to the effective scope of the claims because of the open language used in defining the functional groups in the face of the closed language used in the markush groupings of the parent claim. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, the term "is" has been employed instead of "includes."

With respect to claim 24, the Examiner believes that the same is inconsistent with the parent claim 23 inasmuch as the parent claim 23 does not allow for combinations of alkyl and alkoxy groups. Claim 23 has been amended in a manner to obviate this rejection. Applicants do not believe that new matter has been added in view of the written description on page 7.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments, the Applicants believe that they have properly set forth the invention and accordingly, respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections provided in the last Office Action. A formal Notice of Allowance of claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 21-27 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Advisory Action and Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated February 22, 2008. Therein, the Examiner noted that Claims 23-26 of the Response dated January 22, 2008 did not include the correct "status indicators." Because the Response filed January 22, 2008 was an After-Final Amendment, Applicants understand that no new time period is given, but if Applicants wish to resubmit the Non-Compliant After-Final Amendment with corrections, the entire corrected Amendment must be resubmitted. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this submission satisfies this rule. Moreover, inasmuch as the three-month period for reply to the final Office Action dated December 5, 2007 is March 5, 2008, and this corrected Response is being filed prior to that date, no extension or other fee is believed due with the filing of this Response. In the event that a fee is due or that any amount should be credited, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additions fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0925.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur M. Reginelli, Reg. No. 40,139
Tama L. Drenski, Reg. No. 50,323
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
Fourth Floor, First National Tower
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants

March 3, 2008